WO

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

	Ţ	United States of America v.	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING DISPOSITION
	I	Lindsey Darren Evanston	Case Number: CR-11-01291-PHX-ROS
			§ 3143(a)(1), a detention hearing has been submitted to the Court. I : (Check one or both, as applicable.)
	the d	_	nity and requires the detention of the defendant pending disposition in
$\boxtimes$			requires the detention of the defendant pending disposition in this case.
		PART	I FINDINGS OF FACT
	(1)	18 U.S.C. §3142 (e)(2)(A): Th	e defendant has been convicted of a (federal offense)(state or local
		existed) that is  □ a crime of violence as def □ an offense for which the r	ederal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had ined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4).  naximum sentence is life imprisonment or death.  eximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in
		offenses described in 18 U any felony that involves a destructive device (as those	ded after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal J.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses. a minor victim or that involves the possession or use of a firearm or se terms are defined in section 921), or any other dangerous weapon, or ter under 18 U.S.C. §2250.
	(2)	18 U.S.C. §3142(e)(2)(B): The on release pending trial for a federal	offense described in finding 1 was committed while the defendant was eral, state or local offense.
	(3)	•	period of not more than five years has elapsed since the (date of ant from imprisonment) for the offense described in finding 1.
	(4)		tablish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of the safety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find d this presumption.
			Alternative Findings
	(1)	☐ for which a maximum term ☐ under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c),	probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense m of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

		an offense involving a minor victim under section <sup>2</sup>
(2)	coml	defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the y of the community.
	30120	Alternative Findings
(1)		e is a serious risk that the defendant will flee; no condition or combination of conditions will
(2)	No o	onably assure the appearance of the defendant as required. condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of others and the munity.
(3)	Ther	e is a serious risk that the defendant will (obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice) (threaten, injure, or aidate a prospective witness or juror).
(4)		defendant has failed to prove by clear and convincing evidence that he does not pose a risk of flight
		PART II WRITTEN STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DETENTION (Check one or both, as applicable.)
		2
(1)		d that the credible testimony and information <sup>3</sup> submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and incing evidence as to danger that:
(1)		
(1)		
(1)	conv	
, ,	conv	incing evidence as to danger that:
, ,	I find	incing evidence as to danger that:  If that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:  The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.  The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond
, ,	I find ⊠	Incing evidence as to danger that:  If that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:  The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.  The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.
, ,	I find	incing evidence as to danger that:  If that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:  The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.  The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond
, ,	conv I find  □  ⊠	Incing evidence as to danger that:  If that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:  The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.  The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.  The defendant has a prior criminal history.  There is a record of prior failure to appear in court as ordered.
, ,	conv I find  □  ⊠	I that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:  The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.  The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.  The defendant has a prior criminal history.
, ,	I find	It that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:  The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.  The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.  The defendant has a prior criminal history.  There is a record of prior failure to appear in court as ordered.  The defendant attempted to evade law enforcement contact by fleeing from law enforcement.
(2)	I find	that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:  The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.  The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.  The defendant has a prior criminal history.  There is a record of prior failure to appear in court as ordered.  The defendant attempted to evade law enforcement contact by fleeing from law enforcement.  The defendant is facing a minimum mandatory of

 $<sup>{}^{2}\</sup>text{Insert as applicable 18 U.S.C. }\S\$1201,\ 1591,2241-42,\ 2244(a)(1),\ 2245,\ 2251,\ 2251A,\ 2252(a)(1),\ 2252(a)(2),\ 2252(a)(3,\ 2252(a)(4),\ 2260,\ 2421,\ 2422,\ 2423,\ or\ 2425.$ 

 $<sup>^3</sup>$ The rules concerning admissibility of evidence in criminal trials do not apply to the presentation and consideration of information at the [detention] hearing. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f). See 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) for the factors to be taken into account.

## Case 2:11-cr-01291-ROS Document 49 Filed 02/12/16 Page 3 of 3

by driving under the influence of alcohol, associating with a person engaged in criminal activity, leaving his approved residence and relocating without notifying the probation officer, using opiates and alcohol. Based on the defendant's continued substance abuse issues the Court finds that he poses a risk of flight and is unlikely to abide by any conditions.

The Court incorporates by reference the findings of the Pretrial Services Agency which were reviewed by the Court at the time of the hearing in this matter.

## PART III -- DIRECTIONS REGARDING DETENTION

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his/her designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

## PART IV -- APPEALS AND THIRD PARTY RELEASE

IT IS ORDERED that should an appeal of this detention order be filed with the District Court, it is counsel's responsibility to deliver a copy of the motion for review/reconsideration to Pretrial Services at least one day prior to the hearing set before the District Court. Pursuant to Rule 59(a), FED.R.CRIM.P., effective December 1, 2009, Defendant shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of service of a copy of this order or after the oral order is stated on the record within which to file specific written objections with the district court. Failure to timely file objections in accordance with Rule 59(a) may waive the right to review. 59(a), FED.R.CRIM.P.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if a release to a third party is to be considered, it is counsel's responsibility to notify Pretrial Services sufficiently in advance of the hearing before the District Court to allow Pretrial Services an opportunity to interview and investigate the potential third party custodian.

Dated this 12<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2016.

Bridget S. Bade

United States Magistrate Judge